

THE PREVALENCE OF RELATIONSHIP VIOLENCE AMONG
COLLEGE STUDENTS: MEN AND WOMEN'S ROLE IN PARTNER
VIOLENCE

A Senior Honors Thesis

by

CALLI BAILEY

Submitted to the Office of Honors Programs
Texas A&M University
In partial fulfillment of the requirements of the

UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE
RESEARCH FELLOWS

April 2008

Major: Political Science

ABSTRACT

The Prevalence of Relationship Violence among College Students: Men and Women's Role in Partner Violence (April 2008)

Calli Bailey
Department of Sociology
Texas A&M University

Fellows Advisor: Jeffrey Ackerman, Ph. D.
Department of Sociology

The purpose of this research is to find more definitive answers about relationship violence as it occurs among dating couples. More specifically, this research seeks to understand how relationship violence may be different for a unique population of dating couples: college students. This study uses an online survey tool administered to 30 college students at a large southern university to gather data on the topic. The survey was created to look specifically at the rate at which college students engage in various levels relationship violence, including both verbal and physical aggression, and to compare the rates of aggression between college males and females. Aggression was measured by the Conflict Tactics Scale, or the CTS2. The results of this research found that over 30% of college dating couples have experienced an aggressive relationship. In these

relationships, most of the aggression was characterized by minor physical aggression and verbal aggression, and not severe violence. Males and females participated in the former two levels of aggression at similar rates. The data findings reflect gender symmetry for multiple dependent variables.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Literature Review.....	2
The Importance of Research on Aggressive Relationships.....	5
RESEARCH PURPOSE.....	9
RESEARCH METHOD.....	11
Sample.....	11
Survey tool.....	11
FINDINGS/DATA ANALYSIS.....	13
Descriptive Findings.....	13
Confirming the Conclusions Made by Preexisting Literature...	14
Main Results.....	17
Errors and Limitations.....	26
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	30
REFERENCES.....	33
APPENDIX A: TELEPHONE SCHEDULING.....	34
APPENDIX B: CODEBOOK FOR RELATIONSHIP SURVEY.....	35
CURRICULUM VITA.....	49

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1 Descriptive Statistics.....	15
2 Current Relationship Aggression.....	18
3 Past Relationship Aggression.....	18
4 Cross Tabulation of Gender and Obtaining Information to Settle Arguments	21
5 Cross Tabulation of Gender and Refusing to Talk about an Issue.....	21
6 Cross Tabulation of Gender and Stomping Out during a Disagreement.....	24
7 Cross Tabulation of Gender and Spiting a Partner	24
8 Cross Tabulation of Gender and Crying.....	25
9 Cross Tabulation of Gender and Threatening a Partner.....	26

INTRODUCTION¹

People of all ages, from all walks of life, participate in various roles within romantic relationships, where they can benefit from companionship, trust, or a sympathetic partner who will listen after they've had a bad day. Relationships, however, can have their ups and downs, no matter how old the couple or how long the relationship. It is normal and healthy for even the happiest couples to have an occasional disagreement every once in a while. For a significant portion of the population, however, these disagreements also include physical and verbal aggression (Straus and Yodanis 1996). There are some very important considerations worth mentioning about aggressive relationships that are important for this project.

First, there should be some distinctions made among the different types of relationships. Married couples are different from cohabiting and dating couples because married partners typically live together and have children, though both are not required. A married couple, for instance, may live apart because one of the partners is deployed in the military overseas or is in the transition of changing jobs and therefore lives in another city or state. Children are also not part of every married couple; however, both living together and children are common characteristics that distinguish married couples from other types of relationships. Furthermore, a marriage is not easy to end due to legal and financial barriers that a couple must overcome to end their relationship. This is an important characteristic that distinguishes married couples from other types of relationships in which couples may break up whenever they want.

¹ This thesis follows the style and format of *Violence Against Women*.

There are also important distinctions between cohabiting and dating couples. The important factor defining a cohabiting couple is that they are living together under the same roof, while also being in a romantic relationship. In his 2004 study, Straus defines dating as “a dyadic relationship involving meeting for social interaction and joint activities with an explicit or implicit intention to continue the relationship until one or the other party terminates or until some other more committed relationship is established (e.g., cohabiting, engagement, or marriage)” (Straus 2004). In contrast, dating couples are participating in a romantic relationship while living apart. This may be because the couple is young and still living with their parents or are living apart for other reasons, for example, they are college students living in same sex only dorms or are simply not ready to move in together. Dating couples will be the focus of this study.

Literature Review

Relationship violence that occurs between partners can include both physical and verbal aggression. Verbal aggression includes yelling and screaming in anger, as well as, swearing or name calling. Murray Straus explains physical aggression as including threatening to throw or throwing something, biting, hitting, slapping, pushing, punching, or using a weapon towards their partner. Physical aggression ranges from a minor level to a major level. Minor physical aggression includes throwing something at a partner, pushing, shoving, grabbing and slapping a partner. Severe physical aggression includes kicking, punching, choking, beating up, burning or scalding, slamming against a wall, and using a weapon against a partner. Physical aggression occurs in anywhere between 20% and 40% of these dating relationships (Straus and Yodanis 1996). That means that

a little less than half of the couples you know personally may have been physically aggressive towards each other at some time, or even on a regular basis. Similar rates exist for verbal aggression.

Another conclusion that is important to note is that physical violence occurs more than twice as often in dating couples than it does in married couples (Dietz and Straus 1997). This trend has been demonstrated by over 50 studies since 1980 (Straus 2004). Dating couples are on average younger than married couples. Therefore, it is younger couples that engage in more physical aggression than older couples. As the age of a couple increases, the incidence of physical aggression towards a partner decreases. The older the couple and the more children they have, the less likely aggression is to occur among the couple (Straus and Sweet 1992). These conclusions about married couples are compelling reasons as to why the likelihood of physical aggression may be very different among dating couples because their relationship is very different.

Now that I have made some important distinctions and conclusions about couple types in general, it is important to consider gender differences. Some recent research concerning relationship violence has questioned the idea that women are most often the victims of the physical aggression and unlikely to be the perpetrators. A number of studies have found that men and women engage in about equal amounts of physical and verbal aggression towards their partner (Straus and Sweet 1992). The studies that focused specifically on dating couples found that rates of assault were also about equal for men and women (Dietz and Straus 1997, Medeiros and Straus 1996). During these

assaults against partners, women not only engage in violence as often as men, but they also initiate the violence as often as men.

Rose Medeiros and Murray Straus provide one theory for the reasons why women may participate in partner violence as often as men. They argue that women do not engage in violence towards their partners simply in self-defense. Less than 15% of the violence engaged in by women is in self-defense (Medeiros and Straus 1996). They believe that partner violence is not a uniquely male crime where men hit women in an act of domination, and women do not solely assault their male partners in a desperate act to protect themselves. However, there is not unanimous agreement among sociologists about whether this gender-symmetry finding is correct, and if correct, what precisely it means. Moreover, these conclusions have failed to specifically address the relative prevalence of male on female versus female on male violence within samples of college students. Because the literature on partner violence suggests that this issue is important, I propose to examine a similar question among college students.

As verified by a number of studies across North America, the prevalence of physical aggression among dating couples is extremely high for university students (Straus 2004). It is important to explore this section of the dating population because physical assaults occur very frequently among young adults (Straus 2004). College students are more likely to engage in true dating relationships, where the couple is neither married nor living together, but are romantic with one another and participate in activities as a couple. College may be the first time that a male or female is allowed to truly date and therefore, increases the size of the dating population exposed to partner violence. Living

away from home and attending college provides more opportunities for dating relationships to occur, as the couple no longer lives with a parent or guardian. This also provides fewer opportunities to observe and intervene in aggressive relationships.

An even stronger reason to focus on this portion of the dating population is because of this impressionable stage of life. The college years can be a very formative period of life in which a young student can develop behavior that will persist for the rest of their lifetime (Straus 2004). Therefore, if a pattern of behavior that they adopt in college is physical aggression towards a romantic partner, this pattern of behavior will likely persist throughout future relationships.

The Importance of Research on Aggressive Relationships

A relationship does not have to include physical violence to be considered aggressive. There is a large portion of the population that may experience very real and immediate fear when they get into an argument with their romantic partner even in the absence of physical assault. Relationship violence is not only a serious social problem, but a serious psychological problem. We need to understand why someone may say that they are in love, but at the same time, this “love” they speak of is also characterized by physical and verbal aggression. Why is a person in more serious physical or psychological danger from their family or their intimate relationship than from a stranger? (Straus and Yodanis 1996)

When physical and verbal aggression does occur in a relationship, it can include both physical and psychological harm. A person may not only experience physical injuries from an aggressive partner, but may also experience low self-esteem, drastic behavioral

changes, and even serious depression. Furthermore, psychological implications are important when looking at the perpetrator, not just the victim. The underlying reasons for a partner's aggressive tendencies may be psychological. The primary focus of this paper will not be to determine the psychological reasons for violence, but it is important to note that psychological causes for violence may play a role. It is important to find the root of the psychological problem if we wish to take steps in the direction of prevention in the future.

Steps toward prevention will depend on the knowledge we can obtain from the underlying causes of this romantic violence, which may include psychological reasons, such as depression resulting from childhood experiences, or social reasons, such as trouble at work (Dietz and Straus 1997). A sounder theoretical understanding of partner violence can lead to steps toward prevention, but in the case that prevention is too late and violence has already occurred, knowledge about the root causes can also help in designing treatment programs for those most inclined to use violence against their partner. Knowing the root causes of relationship violence in general is important, but it is also important to distinguish the extent to which the root causes of violence may be different for men and women. And if they are different, then the ways to prevent violence will also be different for each sex. In order to prevent violence, it will be necessary to identify potential root causes before they occur or at the first sign of them.

Furthermore, research on relationship violence among dating couples is important because of what it can tell us about the future for the partners involved. Dating is only one of the many stages in a person's life cycle. It is a stage which usually occurs before

more serious relationships, such as cohabitation and marriage. Domestic violence also has a sort of life cycle, in which dating violence may be only one of many stages. Therefore, if dating is one of the stages in domestic violence for a person, and therefore violence is occurring in a person's dating relationship, then this violence could give us important knowledge on that person's future relationships.

Dating violence can help us to better understand violence that occurs in marriage. If dating is one of the earlier stages in the domestic violence cycle, then it could be possible for prevention programs to target violence during this stage, therefore preventing violence in marriage. Violent behaviors, once they occur, can typically persist over a lifetime. Preventing violence in the future is a very important task if the couple is married and children are involved. If patterns of violent behavior persist in an abuser throughout marriage, then the children produced in that marriage could also be in physical danger.

Research on relationship violence as a whole is important to our society. But you may be asking why my research in particular is important and what new information can it provide? The majority of previous research on violence among intimate partners has focused primarily on either married couples or dating, cohabiting couples. This leaves out a significant portion of the population who might also be caught in aggressive relationships- college students. College students, perhaps just as much as the other groups, are likely to experience physical aggression in their intimate relationships (Straus 2004). Many of the factors that characterize aggressive relationships among

married or cohabiting couples could be the same for college students, or otherwise lead us to see new results that are unique for this portion of the population.

Unlike the other two groups, dating college couples are not married and do not usually live with their significant other. There are also other characteristics that can separate college students from married and cohabiting couples, and therefore, make their rates of aggression different. College students may still be dependent on their parents for financial assistance and may not hold a professional, full time job if they are attending classes. College students are less likely to be parents than are married couples. Therefore, all these characteristics are examples of how college students are different from married and cohabiting couples, and could therefore, be experiencing different trends in relationship violence. This group of subjects has the potential to provide us with a great deal of new information about relationship violence among dating partners by focusing on a section of our population where the dynamics of physical and verbal aggression may or may not be the same as in older groups.

RESEARCH PURPOSE

Now that I have provided you with a background of relationship violence and dating couples, and told you why research on this topic is important, I will move describe the current project. Because physical and verbal aggression is occurring in a larger percentage of the dating population, and because relationship violence is a serious concern, my research will provide more concrete findings that will expand our knowledge on aggressive dating relationships and the degree to which gender symmetry may exist. In particular, I wish to examine the prevalence of physical and verbal aggression, as well as the rates of both males and females in this aggression, as it occurs among an important portion of the dating population- college students. The questions surrounding aggressive relationships among college students have not been answered- How often does it occur? And who participates in this aggression?

It is important to find these answers because no one has yet done so. College students today do not live in the same world as college students did even twenty years ago. It is important to look at current college students today and see if the world they live in is also a world of abuse between loved ones. This research is important in order to find truth among the assumptions about who is most likely to be the perpetrator and who is most likely to be the victim of aggressive relationships. Before recent research addressed the issue, many people thought that males were most likely to be the perpetrator and women were most likely to be the victims. However, men are also victimized in relationships, and it is important to know whether college males are part of this group.

During my search to find the answer to the prevalence of relationship violence among college students and the degree to which gender symmetry exists, individual characteristics of survey respondents will be considered. I will examine the relationship between two variables: gender and violence. More specifically, I will attempt to answer the question- Do female college students physically and verbally abuse male college students as frequently as college males physically and verbally abuse college females? In the course of answering this question, I will test this hypothesis:

Women who attend college will be just as likely to be aggressive towards their male partner as men attending college will be aggressive towards their female partners.

Though there has been some debate over whether gender symmetry in relationship violence exists, Murray Straus argues that it does exist. I believe that we will find evidence that is supportive of his argument among dating college couples. I will be examining various types of aggression and other forms of settling arguments. I expect to find more gender symmetry with less serious forms of aggression. I will measure both physical and verbal aggression between males and females by using the Conflict Tactics Scale, which looks at levels of aggression and the frequency at which they occur. The CTS is explained in detail in the following section.

RESEARCH METHOD

Sample

In order to expand the knowledge on relationship violence among college dating couples, I administered an online survey to a sample of college students at a large undergraduate university to gather data on our topic. Participants in my survey were recruited from Texas A&M University. I used a pool of undergraduate students who had previously been recruited by for other sociology experiments and had volunteered to participate again in future research to draw my sample. These students ranged in age from 18 to 23 and included freshman, sophomores, juniors, and seniors. The students came from all college majors and various backgrounds. These students were paid for their participation in the previous experiment and were promised payment again for this survey. I called these students by phone to schedule them for a time to come to campus and complete the survey. I self-administered the surveys on campus using computers from the Texas A&M Sociology Department. The entire sample included 30 students. I contacted approximately 50 students to participate in the survey. Four contacted students declined to participate initially, while seven contacted students never called back to schedule a time slot. Seven students who did agree to participate did not show up as promised.

Survey Tool

The survey tool used in this research was created by the Sociology Department at Texas A&M University. The survey consisted of basic questions concerning the respondents' relationship history. These questions sought to find out whether the

respondent had ever had a relationship, whether they were currently in a relationship, and whether any of these relationships included verbal or physical aggression. The majority of the survey was derived from a modified version of the Conflict Tactics Scales. Murray A. Straus, creator of the Conflict Tactics Scales, describes the tool in his own words:

The CTS was used to measure physical assault by the respondent. The CTS has been used in over 300 studies of both married and dating partners in the past 25 years and there is extensive evidence of reliability and validity (Archer, 1999; Straus, 1990a, 2005b; Straus & Ramirez, 2006 In press). The Physical Assault scale of the CTS2 was used for this study. It includes subscales for “minor” and “severe” assaults. The Minor Assault scale includes acts such as slapping or throwing something at the partner. The Severe Assault scale includes acts such as punching and choking.

I used the CTS in my survey to find out both the severity of violence that may occur and the frequency at which it occurs. For each minor or severe assault question, the respondent was asked to mark how often this type of assault occurred. The scale ranged from “never” to “more than 20 times.” The survey concluded with some demographic questions in order to find out some more personal information about each respondent.

FINDINGS/DATA ANALYSIS

Descriptive Findings

During data analysis I found several important conclusions. But before I can explain the importance of those conclusions and the implications of our finding, I must first detail the characteristics of my sample to better help you understand the results. Table 1 shows the break down of these characteristics. My sample consisted of 30 undergraduate college students. There were 16 males and 14 females who participated in the survey. The age of participants ranged from 18 to 23, with 19 being the average age. 17 freshmen participated in the survey, six sophomores, five juniors, and two seniors. The race and ethnicity of my sample closely resembled the racial and ethnic makeup of Texas A&M University. The majority of respondents were white or European-American at 73.3%. Both the “Black or African-American” and “Hispanic or Latino” categories consisted of 10% of the participants and Asian or Pacific Islanders represented 6.7% of my sample size. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that all respondents reported being in a relationship with a partner of the opposite sex, all were heterosexual relationships.

Under the characteristics of family income, mother’s education, father’s education, and major, I found that my participants ranged widely within these categories. Family income ranged from a minimum of more than \$10,000 per year to a maximum of more than \$200,000 per year. The largest two categories were the “more than \$75,000 and less than \$100,000 per year” category (16.7%) and the “more than \$100,000 and less than \$200,000 per year” category (20%). Roughly one-fourth (23.4%) of the

respondents reported that their family income was less than \$75,000 per year, while eight participants (26.7%) were unsure of their family income per year.

Most participants responded that both their mother's education (46.7%) and their father's education (53.3%) fell in the range of "4 year of Bachelor's Degree" category. However, the minimum level of education that some respondents reported was "High School Graduate (GED)" and the maximum level of education some respondents reported for their parent's was "Masters of Professional Degree (e.g., Law Degree)." Lastly, the respondent's majors ranged very broadly, with no major consisting of a majority or plurality of respondents. At Texas A&M University, there are nine colleges under which a student's major may fall under. For each of the nine categories, at least one respondent had a major within that college.

Confirming the Conclusions Made by Preexisting Literature

Next, I will move to the results of our findings. The survey began by asking whether the respondent had even had a romantic relationship. 28 out of the 30 respondents said yes, with one saying no and one being unsure if their relationship would have been considered dating. I took both the 28 who said yes and the one who was unsure and continued them through the survey. Of those 29, the survey then asked the respondent whether they were currently in a romantic relationship. 15 respondents said they were currently in a romantic relationship and 3 respondents thought that a new relationship was just starting, for a total of 18 respondents. The survey then focused in specifically on that current relationship and asked if they had ever experienced physical or verbal aggression in this relationship. I defined both physical and verbal aggression

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Sex	
Male	53.3
Female	46.7
Age (years)	19.46*
Race/Ethnicity	
White or European-American	73.3
Black or African-American	10
Hispanic or Latino	10
Asian or Pacific Islander	6.7
Student Classification	
Freshman	56.7
Sophomore	20
Junior	16.7
Senior	6.7
Family Income	\$100,000-200,000*
Father's Education	4 Year or Bachelor's**
Mother's Education	4 year or Bachelor's **
Major (College of...)	
Agriculture and Life Sciences	3.3
Business School	10
Education and Human Development	13.3
Engineering	6.7
Geosciences	3.3
Liberal Arts	23.3
Science	10
Veterinary and Biological Sciences	6.7
General Academic Programs	23.3
Number of Cases	30
*Mean **Modal Category	

for them. Of the 18 respondents, six respondents, or 33.3%, said that their relationship had some aggression. Table 2 shows these results.

The survey also asked whether, in any of the respondent's past relationships, there had been any physical or verbal aggression. Of the 28 who answered the question, nine respondents, or 32.1%, reported that they had had a past relationship where there was aggression. Table 3 shows these results. For both questions, whether the relationship was a current or past relationship, the respondents' answers reflected conclusions made by the literature I reviewed earlier in the paper- that anywhere between 20-40% of college students will have experienced an aggressive relationship.

Another important conclusion we found reflects the conclusions that have been made by other scholars- that this aggressiveness will occur more frequently among verbal and minor assaults than among severe physical violence. For the more severe forms of aggression that existed on the Conflict Tactics Scale, we found that many statements reflecting severe violence never occurred among any of the respondents. Each CTS question consisted of a statement and then a scale from which the respondent could chose how often they or their partner had completed such actions during their disagreements. For example, the most severe form of violence the CTS included, which was the last statement on the scale, said: "Used a knife or fired a gun." The respondent could then choose from eight answers: 1. Never, 2. Once, 3. Twice, 4. 3-5 Times, 5. 6-10 Times, 6. 11-20 Times, 7. More than 20 times, and 8. I have no way to know. For CTS questions "Beat," "Choked," "Hit," "Slapped," "Threat to use Weapon," and "Weapon" (the example used above) every single respondent chose "Never." The statement for

each of these more severe CTS statements can be found in the Appendix, however, you can probably infer from each label the level of violence that each statement measured. These six variables were numbers 12 and 14 thru 18 on the Conflict Tactics Scale.

Two conclusions can be drawn from the findings on these six levels of severe violence. First, when aggression did occur, it occurred most often among minor aggression and verbal aggression. Second, the fact that every respondent chose “Never” for these CTS questions reflects gender symmetry because both males and females did not participate in these levels of violence in any relationship. However, it must be noted that some college dating couples may be experiencing more severe levels of aggression, but because of the small sample size used for our survey, our results did not reflect what very small percentage of college dating couples might be experiencing severe aggression. Therefore, a larger sample size may be needed to find statistically significant results for these categories of violence.

Main Results

Next, I will turn to how I tested my hypothesis. To test the hypothesis- that women who attend college will be just as likely to be aggressive towards their male partner as men attending college will be aggressive towards their female partners- I looked at the respondent’s answers to the remaining Conflict Tactics Scale questions. We dropped the CTS questions in which every respondent chose “Never” for their answer and did no further data analysis on these categories of aggression (Beat, Choked, Hit, Slapped, Threat to use Weapon, and Weapon). Again, for each CTS variable a statement was made and then the respondent rated how many times they and their

	Table 2. Current Relationship Aggression	
	Number of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Yes	6	33.3
No	10	55.6
Unsure	2	11.1
Total	18	100.0

	Table 3. Past Relationship Aggression	
	Number of Respondents	Percentage (%)
Yes	9	32.1
No	16	57.1
Unsure	3	10.7
Total	28	100.0

partner did the aggression reflected in the statement. Generally, we would have assumed that the column of answers for the respondent and the column of answers for their partner would have been different. However, in our survey, the subjects said that their partner did each CTS variable just as many times as they did. Answers reported for the

respondent and for their partner were exactly the same. Therefore, in our data analysis we will only be looking at the respondents' answer column.

I generated crosstabs between two variables for my data analysis. The independent variable in these crosstabs was gender- male or female. The dependent variable was each CTS question. Because this survey sample size was very small, I chose to collapse the respondents' answer choices for each CTS variable to reflect only two categories. One category would show the number and percentage of respondents who reported that the behavior never occurred and the second category reflecting the number and percentage of respondents who reported that the behavior occurred at least one or more times. In my hypothesis I defined an aggressive relationship as a relationship where aggression occurred at least once. This was my reasoning for collapsing the answer choices. I have chosen to look at six different CTS variables in this paper, four of which reflect gender symmetry and two of which reflect asymmetry.

The first CTS variable we will look at measured whether each partner obtained information to back up their side of the story during a disagreement. In this CTS question the statement read: "Got information to back up your/his/her side of things." The answer choices were the eight detailed earlier. You will see in Table 4 that 2 females said "Never" and 2 males said "Never," which make up 14.3% and 12.5% respectively. Furthermore, 12 females and 14 males reported doing this action at least one or more times, 85.7% and 87.5% respectively. The percentages show almost no difference between males and females for their responses to one of the most minor

categories on the scale of aggression. This CTS question came second, only after the first statement which read “Discussed an issue calmly.”

Below the 2 x 2 crosstab, you will notice a note that indicates the results of the chi-square test. The p value is the p value associated with the chi-square statistic. The question the chi-square test answers is whether the values we evaluated in each cell differ from what we would expect to find in this table if we entered numbers randomly by chance. It tells us whether the numbers in the cells of this table are in any way different than what you would expect to find if the effect of gender on the CTS question was random.

If this was a large sample and we wanted to use the generally accepted standard for statistical significance, we would look for a p value of .05 or lower to reflect a statistically significant difference among the variables. However, we realize that the sample is small and that a value of .05 or lower is unrealistic. Even if we inflated the acceptable p value to .20, the value associated with the chi-square statistics of this table would still be greatly over that value. A very large p value tells us that we have little to no proof that the small differences we found are not due to chance alone. The p value for this table is .886, well over the inflated value of .20. This leads us to believe that there is no statistical difference between males and females for this CTS variable. In other words, we have no proof that the independent variable has no effect on the levels of aggression measured by the Conflict Tactics Scale, and thus, gender symmetry exists for this category.

Table 4. Cross Tabulation of Gender and Obtaining Information to Settle Arguments*			
	Never	One or more times	Total
Female	2 14.3%	12 85.7%	14 100.0%
Male	2 12.5%	14 87.5%	16 100.0%
Total	4 13.3%	26 86.7%	30 100.0%

*Chi-Square Test: p value = .886

Table 5. Cross Tabulation of Gender and Refusing to Talk*			
	Never	One or more times	Total
Female	6 42.9%	8 57.1%	14 100.0%
Male	8 50%	8 50%	16 100.0%
Total	14 46.7%	16 53.3%	30 100.0%

*Chi-Square Test: p value = .696

The second CTS variable I will address here measured whether or not the partner sulked or refused to talk about a disagreement. The fifth of 18 CTS statements, it read: “Sulked or refused to talk about an issue.” You will see in Table 5 that 6 females said “Never” and 8 males said “Never,” which make up 42.9% and 50% respectively.

Furthermore, 8 females and 8 males reported doing this action at least one or more times, 57.1% and 50% respectively. As you can see, males were split evenly among this CTS variable and females closely resembled the same trend, though females were a little more likely to sulk or refuse to discuss the issue. Though the percentages are a little farther apart for this variable, there is still a fairly small difference between males and females. Furthermore, the p value generated by the chi-square test was .696. This is still a value well over the inflated .20. This reflects a 69.6% chance that gender had no effect on this CTS variable, and instead, was most likely random.

The next CTS variable I will display measured whether the partner ever stomped out of the room during a disagreement. The sixth variable in a scale of 18, the statement for this variable of aggression read: “Stomped out of the room or house or yard.” You will see in Table 6 that 9 females said “Never” and 10 males said “Never,” which make up 64.3% and 62.5% respectively. Furthermore, 5 females and 6 males reported doing this action at least one or more times, 35.7% and 37.5% respectively. This CTS variable is the best example of gender symmetry we have, and will, see in this report. For each answer category, there is less than a 2% difference between males and females. This is a miniscule difference and reflects a similarity between the frequency at which males and females are likely to stomp out during a disagreement. At a p value of .919, the highest p value reflected for any CTS variable, the chi-square test tells us that there is a 91.9% chance that gender has no effect on the dependent variable and is, instead, random. There is no statistically significant difference between men and women on this CTS variable.

The fourth CTS variable that I will place in the report to reflect gender symmetry measures whether or not a partner ever did something to spite their partner. The statement read: “Did or said something to spite him/her/you.” This was the eighth variable in the scale of 18. You will see in Table 7 that 6 females said “Never” and 6 males said “Never,” which make up 42.9% and 37.5% respectively. Furthermore, 8 females and 10 males reported doing this action at least one or more times, 57.1% and 62.5% respectively. It is significant that a majority of both men and women had done or said something to spite their partner at least once. Though the percentages in this table are slightly farther apart than the results from Table 6, there is still a small difference among the results. The chi-square test generated a p value of .765. This value is also well over the .20 inflated value and reflects the high-percentage likelihood that the effect of gender on the dependent variable is random and no significant difference exists between males and females among this CTS variable.

Next, I would like to provide two examples of CTS variables where gender symmetry may not exist and differences were reported between males and females. The first is the CTS variable that measured whether or not a partner cried during a disagreement. The statement read simply: “Cried.” You will see in Table 8 that 4 females said “Never” and 10 males said “Never,” which make up 28.6% and 62.5% respectively. Furthermore, 10 females (71.4%) and only 6 males (37.5%) reported doing this action at least one or more times. The chi-square test generated the lowest p value among all CTS variables at .063. Whether we use the inflated .20 p value or the commonly used .05, this number is significantly low. There were distinct differences

Table 6. Cross Tabulation of Gender and Stomping Out during a Disagreement*			
	Never	One or more times	Total
Female	9 64.3%	5 35.7%	14 100.0%
Male	10 62.5%	6 37.5%	16 100.0%
Total	19 63.3%	11 36.7%	30 100.0%

*Chi-Square Test: p value = .919

Table 7. Cross Tabulation of Gender and Spiting a Partner*			
	Never	One or more times	Total
Female	6 42.9%	8 57.1%	14 100.0%
Male	6 37.5%	10 62.5%	16 100.0%
Total	12 40.0%	18 60.0%	30 100.0%

*Chi-Square Test: p value = .765

between male and female respondents. Female respondents were more likely to have cried during a disagreement with their partner than males. However, I think it is important to note some assumptions about gender differences concerning crying. Males

may think that crying is an inferior, female display of emotion and therefore, would be less likely to cry in front of their female partner or report that they had.

Table 8.			
Cross Tabulation of Gender and Crying*			
	Never	One or more times	Total
Female	4 28.6%	10 71.4%	14 100.0%
Male	10 62.5%	6 37.5%	16 100.0%
Total	14 46.7%	16 53.3%	30 100.0%

*Chi-Square Test: p value = .063

The second CTS variable that I want to address that reflected differences in male and female respondents' answers is measured by whether or not a partner ever threatened violence toward their partner. The ninth variable in a scale of 18, the statement read: "Threatened to hit or throw something at him/her/you." You will see in Table 9 that 11 females said "Never" and 15 males said "Never," which make up 78.6% and 93.8% respectively. Furthermore, 3 females (21.4%) and only 1 male (6.3%) reported doing this action at least one or more times. The p value generated by the chi-square test (.222) is not as low as the p value generated in the "Cried" variable; however, the differences in the percentages are clear. Though it is obvious that a majority of both

males and females are unlikely to ever threaten their partner, I think it is significant that with such a small sample as this one, we found respondents who had threatened their partner one or more times. Moreover, in this sample, females were more likely to report that they had threatened their partner at least once. This variable represents the mid- to severe-levels of aggression and was one of the more severe levels of aggression where more than one respondent reported participating (not including the six variables that were dropped).

Table 9. Cross Tabulation of Gender and Threatening a Partner*			
	Never	One or more times	Total
Female	11 78.6%	3 21.4%	14 100.0%
Male	15 93.8%	1 6.3%	16 100.0%
Total	26 86.7%	4 13.3%	30 100.0%

*Chi-Square Test: p value = .222

I chose these CTS variables to incorporate in the paper because they were clear examples of gender symmetry and asymmetry. They all represented various levels of the CTS, from minor to more severe (though six of the seven most severe CTS variables

at the end of the scale were dropped). While the CTS variables measuring whether a partner refused to talk about an issue or did something to spite their partner showed miniscule differences among males and females, both CTS variables measuring obtaining information and stomping out during an argument reflect clear examples of the random effect that gender has on the dependent variables. Gender symmetry is displayed in all four variables. The high p values generated by the chi-square tests support this conclusion. In terms of my second hypothesis I found some mixed results. However, on most of the CTS variables, I found that males and females participated in aggressive relationships at about the same rates. And in these variables, gender symmetry did in fact exist. Furthermore, part B of the first hypothesis was further confirmed- when men and women did participate in aggressive relationships, the aggression was mostly among minor and verbal aggression.

Errors and Limitations

Next, I will discuss some difficulties that I encountered throughout the research process and then I will address the limitations to my research findings. As previously described, I self-administered an online survey tool to a pool of research participants. Throughout the creation of the survey, I encountered some important errors and limitations to using this kind of survey. The survey tool was new and I was essentially the first to test it. Therefore, I ran into technical errors while trying to build upon the survey and add additional questions and skip patterns. My research advisor, Dr. Jeffrey Ackerman of the Sociology Department here at Texas A&M University, and Research Assistant, Graduate Student Tony Paul Love, assisted me with the technical difficulties

and errors that occurred while creating the survey. Some of these technical errors in the tool took time to correct and set us back in terms of our time schedule and getting the survey administered. It took more time to create the survey than we had initially expected.

When administering a survey online, the language of the questions and instructions must be very clear in order for the respondent to answer the questions correctly and without confusion. It was a very long and detailed process to create questions that were both clear and brought about the answers that I was looking for. It is much easier to administer a survey in person and clearly explain each question, while allowing the respondent to ask questions if something is unclear. However, with an online survey tool, I had to make sure questions were clear, placed in a logical order, and would illicit the kind of response I was looking for. Furthermore, depending on the respondent's relationship history, each respondent might answer a different set of questions. Therefore, I had to incorporate skip patterns into the survey tool that would ask each respondent only the logical questions that pertained to them. This took more time and effort than was initially expected as well. It was a detailed process and I ran into a few technical errors when trying to incorporate the skip patterns.

Due to the delay I encountered with creating the survey and getting my project approved, administering the survey to a large pool of students was no longer a realistic option. Initially, I hoped to recruit students through one or two required courses that the University offers. This would give me a random pool of students of all ages, majors, and both sexes. The initial plan was then to email the online survey to those students who

agreed to participate. This would have likely given us a larger pool of diverse research subjects. However, with less time left than I had planned, I had to turn to a convenient pool of research subjects and decrease the number of respondents. I used a pool of research subjects that had previously participated in sociology experiments through the University. I called these students by phone and scheduled them for a time to come up to campus and take the survey in person. Therefore, our subject pool resulted in only 30 students, which was still a sufficient amount to collect significant data results.

The errors I encountered with the survey and in recruiting research subjects led to a few limitations for our data. First, and most importantly, this subject pool cannot be said to generalize for all undergraduate college students. Though I did find that the research subjects were spread fairly evenly among all college majors and socioeconomic status, the subject pool was heavily freshmen, approximately 19 years of age, and of White or European-American descent. Overall, this was a young subject pool. Only 7 of 30 participants were upper classmen- juniors and seniors. Previous research as discussed earlier has supported the idea that violence decreases with age. Recruiting a larger number of upper classmen would have been beneficial to this study. Furthermore, a more even distribution of research participants along racial and ethnic lines would have made the findings more representative of college students in general. However, Texas A&M University in itself is a majority White or European-American student body, therefore, the majority White or European-American subject pool was somewhat expected.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

I think these results are reflective of my sample size and of the conclusions I addressed in my literature review from other scholars in the field. I think I found these results because the life of a modern college student is not like that of 20 years ago or that of modern married and cohabiting couples. I think college dating couples are unique and similar. I believe that a larger sample size would also have resulted in similar rates between males and females among minor levels of physical and verbal aggression. However, the specific findings found here did depend on the sample I used. My sample was small, much smaller than I had intended, and therefore, may not have led to more concrete findings and statistically significant reflections of similarity in aggression.

Future research can only build more upon these findings. Future research should first and foremost use a larger, more representative sample of the student population. A larger sample will provide the opportunity to find significant findings among the severe physical aggression categories where we found nothing. A larger sample would also tell us more about the similarities among men and women in the frequency at which they use various levels of aggression. It may demonstrate smaller, almost invisible differences between males and females.

Future research can also look more into the characteristics of the respondents and their partners. Researchers should analyze the characteristics that are most often associated with aggressive college partners and draw conclusions there. Furthermore, some important conclusions could result from a look into the aggressive partner's past. Was there relationship violence between their parents or in their home growing up? And

if so, was this past family violence determinant of whether or not they would be aggressive in their future relationships. Research on the effect this aggression has on these relationships would also be worthy of future research.

For thousands of young people across America, going away to college after high school has become a norm, a step in life that didn't take much consideration or convincing. As we move further into the twenty-first century, college enrollment rates have increased and continue to grow. More students are moving away from home to experience an atmosphere very different from the one they grew up in. For some, college means independence, the first time away from home, new experiences, growth, and learning. However, not all of these new experiences may be positive. College life of the twenty first century has made great departures from the college life that our parents experienced over twenty years ago. The behavior that occurs as an undergraduate is what encouraged my research. More research and conclusions drawn on this subject will only further benefit our society and those involved in these dangerous, aggressive relationships.

Though the life of college students may be unique, this study has found that college couples' trends in aggression are not very different from other dating couples. The physical and verbal aggression that may occur between some is very real and both men and women participate in these roles. Furthermore, this study found that gender symmetry does exist for certain levels of aggression. While this study unable to find any results on the most severe levels of aggression, males and females did participate in similar rates of aggression for multiple dependent variables measuring minor physical

and verbal aggression, though not all. The results of this study provide support for those scholars who do believe that gender symmetry does exist during relationship violence, but may caution them when applying gender symmetry to all categories of aggression.

REFERENCES

- Dietz, Tracy L. and Murray A. Straus. 1997. "Commitment to partners and violence among college student couples." Durham, NH: University of New Hampshire, Family Research Laboratory. July 11.
- Medeiros, Rose A. and Murray A. Straus. 2006. "Risk factors for physical violence between dating partners: Implications for gender-inclusive prevention and treatment of family violence." *Family approaches in domestic violence: A practitioner's guide to gender-inclusive research and treatment*, edited by J. Hamel and T. Nicholls. New York: Springer.
- Straus, Murray A. 2004. "Prevalence of violence against dating partners by male and female university students worldwide." *Violence Against Women* 10:790-811.
- Straus, Murray A. and Stephen Sweet. 1992. "Verbal/symbolic aggression in couples: Incidence rates and relationships to personal characteristics." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 54:346-357.
- Straus, Murray A. and Carrie L. Yodanis. 1996. "Gender Hostility and Violence Against Dating Partners." *International Society for Research on Aggression*. Strasbourg, France.

APPENDIX A

TELEPHONE SCHEDULING

Telephone Scheduling

Hello. This is _____. I am scheduling for some studies you volunteered for. You were probably recruited in one of your sociology classes for studies that pay for participation. I am calling to schedule one of those studies now. The current study aims to collect data about romantic relationships. The time and the pay for the study vary. Ordinarily, the study can take between 5 and 30 minutes. And the pay for the participation is 7 dollars.

We run our studies in the Academic Building room 305. Do you know where the Academic Building is? (Give directions if they don't know). I have openings for participation at _____ and _____. Are any of these times good for you?

If yes, schedule the person.

If no, ask for a better time.

Thank you very much for your participation. Again, we will see you at (time) in ACAD 305.

APPENDIX B**CODEBOOK FOR RELATIONSHIP SURVEY**

Question#: 1

Question Text: Are you male or female?

1 - Male

2 - Female

Question#: 2

Question Text: From the time you started high school, have you ever had a romantic partner, in other words, have you ever dated someone that you considered to be a boyfriend/girlfriend?

More Info: You should answer "yes" even if the relationship was only for a few days.

Notes: If no, jump past most questions into the video and then the demographics

1 - Yes

2 - No

3 - Not sure if it would be considered dating

If PtrEver = 2 Skip to: #96 - Age

Question#: 3

Question Text: From the time you started high school, approximately how many romantic relationships have you had?

1 - 1

2 - 2

3 - 3

4 - 4

5 - 5 or more

Question#: 4

Question Text: Are you currently in a romantic relationship?

1 - Yes

2 - No

- 3 - I think a new relationship is just starting
 - 4 - Other - please explain by leaving a comment
- If PtrCurrent = 2 Skip to: #7 - AnyAggressive

Question#: 5

Question Text: When did your current relationship start?

- 1 - Less than 1 month ago
- 2 - 1-2 months ago
- 3 - 3-4 months ago
- 4 - 5-6 months ago
- 5 - More than 6 months ago
- 6 - 1 year ago
- 7 - 2 years ago
- 8 - 3 years ago
- 9 - 4 years ago
- 10 - More than 4 years ago

Question#: 6

Question Text: During THIS CURRENT RELATIONSHIP, were there any fairly serious arguments or disagreements where you or your partner yelled or screamed or became physical?

- 1 - Yes
 - 2 - No
 - 3 - We had an argument, but I'm not sure if it was serious
- If RlshipNumber = 1 and PtrCurrent = 1 and CurrentAggressive = 1 Skip to: #13 - Trans1

Question#: 7

Question Text: In ANY PRIOR RELATIONSHIPS since the time you started high school, were there any fairly serious arguments or disagreements where you or your partner yelled or screamed or became physical?

- 1 - Yes
- 2 - No
- 3 - We had an argument, but I'm not sure if it was serious

If PtrCurrent = 2 and AnyAggressive = 2 Skip to: #11 - MostRecent2

If PtrCurrent = 1 and AnyAggressive = 2 Skip to: #13 - Trans1

Question#: 8

Question Text: Including your current relationship, how many of your relationships involved serious arguments with yelling or screaming or physical behavior`?

1 - 1

2 - 2

3 - 3

4 - 4

5 - 5 or more

If CurrentAggressive = 1 and AnyAggressive = 1 Skip to: #13 - Trans1

Question#: 9

Intro: You mentioned that you've been involved in at least one forceful relationship since the time you started high school.

Question Text: Not including any current relationship, when did the most recent forceful relationship end?

1 - Less than 1 month ago

2 - More than 1 month ago but less than a year

3 - About 1 year ago

4 - About 2 years ago

5 - About 3 years ago

6 - About 4 years ago

7 - More than 4 years ago

Question#: 10

Question Text: How long did this most recent forceful relationship last?

1 - Less than 1 month

2 - 1-2 months

3 - 3-4 months

4 - 5-6 months

5 - 6 months to a year

6 - 1 year

7 - 2 years

8 - 3 years

9 - 4 years

10 - More than 4 years

If PtrCurrent = 1 and CurrentAggressive = 2 and AnyAggressive1 Skip to: #15 - Trans3

Question#: 11

Intro: You mentioned that you are not currently in a relationship.

Question Text: Including both forceful and not forceful relationships, when did your most recent relationship end?

1 - Less than 1 month ago

2 - More than 1 month ago but less than a year

3 - About 1 year ago

4 - About 2 years ago

5 - About 3 years ago

6 - About 4 years ago

7 - More than 4 years ago

Question#: 12

Question Text: How long did this most recent relationship last?

1 - Less than 1 month

2 - 1-2 months

3 - 3-4 month

4 - 5-6 months

5 - 6 months to a year

6 - 1 year

7 - 2 years

8 - 3 years

9 - 4 years

10 - More than 4 years

If PtrCurrent = 2 and AnyAggressive = 1 Skip to: #14 - Trans2

If PtrCurrent = 2 and AnyAggressive = 2 Skip to: #16 - Trans4

Question#: 13 (Transition Page)

Intro: You mentioned that you are currently in a relationship. On the next few pages, we will ask you about this current relationship.

If Gender = 1 or Gender = 2 Skip to: #19 - CTSTrans3

Question#: 14 (Transition Page)

Intro: You mentioned a past relationship where either you or your partner acted forcefully at least once. On the next few pages, we will ask you questions about this most recent forceful relationship.

If PtrCurrent = 2 and AnyAggressive = 1 Skip to: #18 - CTSTrans2

Question#: 15 (Transition Page)

Intro: On the next few pages, we would like to ask you a set of questions about two of the relationships you mentioned. First, we will ask about your current relationship and later we will ask you about the one you mentioned where there was some aggression.

If Gender = 1 or Gender = 2 Skip to: #19 - CTSTrans3

Question#: 16 (Transition Page)

Transition Text: On the next few pages, we would now like to ask you a set of questions about your most recent relationship.

Question#: 17 (Transition Page)

Intro: No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, or just have spats or fights because they're in a bad mood or tired or for some other reason. They also use many different ways of trying to settle their differences.

Transition Text: In the next several questions, we are going to list some things that you and your most recent romantic partner may have done when you had an argument. I would like you to tell us how many times you and this recent partner used these various ways of settling those differences.

If Gender = 1 or Gender = 2 Skip to: #20 - CTSCalmly

Question#: 18 (Transition Page)

Intro: No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, or just have spats or fights because they're in a bad mood

or tired or for some other reason. They also use many different ways of trying to settle their differences.

Transition Text: In the next several questions, we are going to list some things that you and this most recent romantic partner may have done during the relationship that involved some aggression. I would like you to tell us how many times you and this partner used these various ways of settling those differences.

If PtrCurrent = 2 and AnyAggressive = 1 and = 0 Skip to: #32 - CTS2Calmly

Question#: 19 (Transition Page)

Intro: No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, or just have spats or fights because they're in a bad mood or tired or for some other reason. They also use many different ways of trying to settle their differences.

Transition Text: In the next several questions, we are going to list some things that you and your current romantic partner may have done when you had an argument. I would like you to tell us how many times you and this current partner used these various ways of settling those differences.

If CurrentAggressive = 1 Skip to: #32 - CTS2Calmly

Question#: 20 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Discussed an issue calmly

- 0- Never
- 1- Once
- 2- Twice
- 3- 3-5 Times
- 4- 6-10 Times
- 5- 11-20 Times
- 6- More than 20 Times
- 7- I have no way to know
- 8- I prefer not to answer

(These answer choice are used for all CTS questions)

Question#: 21 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Got information to back up your/his/her side of things

Question#: 22 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Brought in, or tried to bring in, someone to help settle things

Question#: 23 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Insulted or swore at him/her/you

Question#: 24 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Sulked or refused to talk about an issue

Question#: 25 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Stomped out of the room or house or yard

Question#: 26 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Cried

Question#: 27 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Did or said something to spite him/her/you

Question#: 28 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Threatened to hit or throw something at him/her/you

Question#: 29

Question Text: Did any of these things just mentioned happen in a relationship of yours that occurred on campus, or in the Bryan/College Station area, during a semester in which you were enrolled in classes at A&M?

1 - Yes

2 - No

If PtrCurrent = 2 and AnyAggressive = 2 Skip to: #87 - PartnerSex

If PtrCurrent = 1 and CurrentAggressive = 2 and AnyAggressive = 2 Skip to: #87 - PartnerSex

Question#: 30

Question Text: Did any of these things just mentioned happen in a relationship of yours in which you and your girlfriend/boyfriend were living together?

1 - Yes

2 - No

3 - I prefer not to answer

Question#: 31 (Transition Page)

Transition Text: We have now completed the questions that we wished to ask you concerning your current romantic partner. We would now like to ask you these same questions, along with some additional ones, about the past relationship where you mentioned there was some aggression.

Question#: 32 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Discussed an issue calmly

Question#: 33 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Got information to back up your/his/her side of things

Question#: 34 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Brought in, or tried to bring in, someone to help settle things

Question#: 35 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Insulted or swore at him/her/you

Question#: 36 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Sulked or refused to talk about an issue

Question#: 37 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Stomped out of the room or house or yard

Question#: 38 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Cried

Question#: 39 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Did or said something to spite him/her/you

Question#: 40 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Threatened to hit or throw something at him/her/you

Question#: 41

Section: Aggressive Relationship

Question Text: Did any of these things just mentioned happen in a relationship of yours that occurred on campus, or in the Bryan/College Station area, during a semester in which you were enrolled in classes at A&M?

1 - Yes

2 - No

Question#: 42

Question Text: Did any of these things just mentioned happen in a relationship of yours in which you and your girlfriend/boyfriend were living together?

1 - Yes

2 - No

3 - I prefer not to answer

Question#: 43 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Threw something at him/her/you

Question#: 44 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Pushed, grabbed, or shoved him/her/you

Question#: 45 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Slapped him/her/you

Question#: 46 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Kicked, bit, or hit him/her/you with a fist.

Question#: 47 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Hit or tried to hit him/her/you with something

Question#: 48 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Beat him/her/you up

Question#: 49 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Choked him/her/you

Question#: 50

Question Text: Did any of these things just mentioned happen in a relationship of yours that occurred on campus, or in the Bryan/College Station area, during a semester in which you were enrolled in classes at A&M?

1 - Yes

2 - No

Question#: 51

Question Text: Did any of these things just mentioned happen in a relationship of yours in which you and your girlfriend/boyfriend were living together?

1 - Yes

2 - No

3 - I prefer not to answer

Question#: 52 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Threatened him/her/you with a knife or gun

Question#: 53 (Custom Question)

Question Text: Used a knife or fired a gun

Question#: 54

Question Text: Did any of these things just mentioned happen in a relationship of yours that occurred on campus, or in the Bryan/College Station area, during a semester in which you were enrolled in classes at A&M?

1 - Yes

2 - No

Question#: 55

Question Text: Did any of these things just mentioned happen in a relationship of yours in which you and your girlfriend/boyfriend were living together?

1 - Yes

2 - No

3 - I prefer not to answer

Always Skip to: #87 - PartnerSex

Question#: 87

Question Text: Was this partner male or female?

1 - Male

2 - Female

Question#: 88

Question Text: Was the partner older than you, younger than you, or about the same age?

1 - About the same age

2 - About 1 year older

3 - About 2 years older

4 - More than 2 years older

5 - About 1 year younger

6 - About 2 years younger

7 - More than 2 years younger

8 - I have no way to know.

9 - I prefer not to answer.

Question#: 89

Question Text: Which of the following best describes this partner's race/ethnicity:

1 - White or European American

2 - Black or African American

3 - Hispanic or Latino

4 - Asian or Pacific Islander

5 - Native American

6 - Other

7 - I prefer not to answer

Always Skip to: #96 - Age

Question#: 96

Question Text: How old are you now?

- 1 - 17 or less
- 2 - 18
- 3 - 19
- 4 - 20
- 5 - 21
- 6 - 22
- 7 - 23
- 8 - 24
- 9 - 25
- 10 - 26 to 29
- 11 - 30 to 35
- 12 - 36 to 40
- 13 - 41 or over

Question#: 97

Question Text: Which of the following categories best describes your race/ethnicity:

- 1 - White or European-American
- 2 - Black or African-American
- 3 - Hispanic or Latino
- 4 - Asian or Pacific Islander
- 5 - Native American
- 6 - Other
- 7 - I prefer not to answer

Question#: 98

Question Text: What is your student classification?

- 1 - Freshman
- 2 - Sophomore
- 3 - Junior
- 4 - Senior

- 5 - Continuing Senior
- 6 - Graduate Student
- 7 - Non-Student
- 8 - Other
- 9 - I prefer not to answer.

Question#: 99

Question Text: Which college is your major in?

- 1 - College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
- 2 - College of Architecture
- 3 - Mays Business School
- 4 - College of Education and Human Development
- 5 - Dwight Look College of Engineering
- 6 - College of Geosciences
- 7 - College of Liberal Arts
- 8 - College of Science
- 9 - College of Veterinary Medicine and Biological Sciences
- 10 - Department of General Academic Programs

Question#: 100

Question Text: About how much is your family income?

More Info: By family income, we mean the combined amount that your father, mother, and other relatives who live with you make (if you are a student), or how much your relatives who live with you make (if you are a non-student),

- 1 - Less than \$10,000 per year
- 2 - More than \$10,000 and less than \$20,000 per year
- 3 - More than \$20,000 and less than \$30,000 per year
- 4 - More than \$30,000 and less than \$50,000 per year
- 5 - More than \$50,000 and less than \$75,000 per year
- 6 - More than \$75,000 and less than \$100,000 per year
- 7 - More than \$100,000 and less than \$200,000 per year
- 8 - More than \$200,000 per year
- 9 - I really don't know
- 10 - I prefer not to answer

Question#: 101

Question Text: How much education does your mother have?

- 1 - Less than high school
- 2 - High School Graduate (or GED)
- 3 - Some College
- 4 - 2 year or Associates College Degree
- 5 - 4 year or Bachelors Degree
- 6 - Some Graduate School
- 7 - Masters or Professional Degree (e.g., Law Degree)
- 8 - M.D.
- 9 - Ph.D.
- 10 - I have no way to know

Question#: 102

Question Text: How much education does your father have?

- 1 - Less than high school
- 2 - High School Graduate (or GED)
- 3 - Some College
- 4 - 2 year or Associates College Degree
- 5 - 4 year or Bachelors Degree
- 6 - Some Graduate School
- 7 - Masters or Professional Degree (e.g., Law Degree)
- 8 - M.D.
- 9 - Ph.D.
- 10 - I have no way to know

Curriculum Vita

Calli Bailey

2320 Pintail Ln
College Station, TX 77845
(cell): 214.676.3078

baileycd1@tamu.edu

329 Meadowood Ln
Coppell, TX 75019
(home): 972.462.1247

EDUCATION

Texas A&M University

Bachelor of Arts in Political Science

Minor in History and Sociology

Overall GPR: 4.0

Anticipated Graduation: May 2008, *summa cum laude*

College Station, TX

Aug. 2004- May 2008

Texas Tech University School of Law

Doctor of Jurisprudence (J.D.)

Lubbock, TX

RESEARCH

Texas A&M Undergraduate Honors Research Fellows Class of 2008

- One of only 35 out of 5,5000 undergraduate seniors chosen for an Honors college program that selects students interested in completing a research project for possible publication as their senior thesis
- Met with a faculty advisor once a week for guidance on completing a major research project
- Attend meetings and workshops with fellow research students to master the basics of researching and writing a thesis
- Contacted A&M undergrad students to collect my own data for research, using an online survey tool.
- Thesis title: "The Prevalence of Relationship Violence among College Students: Men and Women's Role in Partner Violence"

LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE

Pre-Law Society Member & Vice President

Sept. 2004- Present

- Attended weekly meetings and socials organized to learn about opportunities in the field of law from professionals at universities and law firms. Selected as VP spring semester of my junior year.
- As Vice President, I was in charge of coordinating and scheduling events, whether the event be a guest speaker, a social event, or an event hosted by an LSAT prep course.
- Ran the Mock LSAT tests provided for members in order to prepare for law school by contacting the A&M campus to make arrangements for a test day and place, as well as signing students up for the test.
- Supported and helped the president balance any extra work and duties they cannot handle on their own and take his/her place if absent. All officers also help run Texas A&M's Law School Caravan in November each year.

Child Protective Services Volunteer

Feb. 2007- May 2007

- Dedicated free time at the Bryan, TX office to compile informational packets for potential child care providers, as well as making copies and filing important documents for the Child Care Licensing Dept.
- In a slightly informal atmosphere, the women working at CPS also shared with me some of the stories that characterize their work, for example children being left unattended and in harms way, allowing me to learn through stories about real people and real problems that occur during child care

Fish Camp Counselor

March- Sept., 2005 & 2006

- Selected two years from a pool of over 1,000 applicants to be a counselor in the most competitive on-campus student led organization at Texas A&M and nationally recognized freshmen orientation program
- Dedicated time and attended training programs with a group of peers during spring semesters to learn essential skills needed to help freshmen have a smooth transition into college
- Worked with a group of peers during the summer leading freshmen in discussion groups at an off-campus camp site to teach them how to be successful in college and learn the traditions of A&M

INTERNSHIP EXPERIENCE

Office of George H. W. Bush

Houston, TX

Sept. 2007- Present

- Indexed invitations that the Former President Bush and Mrs. Bush received to attend special events. Recorded and responded to requests made for special appearances at birthday parties, wedding anniversaries, and Eagle Scout ceremonies that Bush Sr. received.
- Volunteered free time while not at the office to work special events sponsored by the George Bush Library Foundation, such as Library Anniversary's and special event and award ceremonies, like The George Bush Award in Public Service
- In charge of meeting and greeting special guests, making sure they are taken care of and have everything they need, as well as making sure they get safely to their seats and their transportation. Special guests have included Rudy Giuliani and Secretary of Defense Robert Gates.

Republican National Committee

Washington, D.C.

May – Aug. 2007

- The only intern in the Member Relations office of the RNC, mastered the skills of Microsoft Excel, creating labels and envelopes for large mailing projects sent to over 170 members.
- Had extensive contact with state Republican Party members through phone and email.
- Helped coordinate and set up intern events, as my supervisor was the Intern Coordinator. Events included guest speakers such as Former Deputy Chief of Staff Karl Rove and a photo-op with Vice President Dick Cheney.
- Helped coordinate the Republican National Committee's Summer Meeting in Minneapolis, Minnesota which included speakers such as First Lady Laura Bush and Republican Presidential Candidate Mitt Romney.
- Met and conversed with all state party members while running the registration desk in Minnesota.
- Coordinated the set up of ballrooms and conferences rooms for member meetings and speakers, as well as helped control the promptness and fluidity of scheduled events.

HONORS AND AWARDS

Dean's List- maintaining a 4.0 GPR

Fall 2004- Present

University Honors Program

Jan. 2006- Present

- Member of a university program that required students to take advanced, honors courses each semester

Phi Kappa Phi- Honor Society

Jan. 2007- Present